

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 8, 10, 16-18, 20, 27, 32, and 37 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 3, 14, 15, 21, 23, 28, and 36 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-15, 21-23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, and 36 are pending and under consideration.

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS:

Applicant respectfully submits that new FIGS. 10 and 11, illustrate a first case where a lever does not contact paper, and a second case where the lever contacts the paper, respectively, to explain an operation of another embodiment of the apparatus of FIG. 4. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In the Office Action, at page 2, the Examiner objected to the Specification for the reasons set forth therein.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added, and that the amendments to the Drawings and the Specification overcome the Examiner's objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, at page 2, item 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 21-23, 25-29 31, 33, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claim amendments overcome the Examiner's rejection.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

In the Office Action, at page 25, item 16, the Examiner indicated that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Additionally, the Examiner indicated that claims 2, 3, 27, and 28 would be allowable rewritten in independent form and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are overcome.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claims 2 and 27 have been respectively incorporated into claims 1 and 21, and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are overcome.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into independent claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-7, 14, 15, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 31-33 are now allowable.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at page 4, item 3, the Examiner rejected claims 16-18, 20, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tsubo (U.S. 4,674,736 – hereinafter Tsubo).

In the Office Action, at page 6, item 4, the Examiner rejected claims 16-18, 20-23, 25-26, 29 and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Innoue et al. (U.S. 6,382,621 – hereinafter Innoue). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-18, 20, 32, and 37 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

As noted above, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 27 has been incorporated into claim 21, and that claims 21, 22, 25, 26, and 29 are now allowable.

Claim 23 has been rewritten in independent form, and recites: "...wherein the lever selectively contacts the paper while the stripper contacts the paper."

And amended, independent claim 36 recites: "...a shaker controlling the lever by intermittently shaking the plate to move with respect to the paper fed by the pickup roller, to intermittently contact the paper via the lever while the stripper contacts the paper."

Regarding claims 23 and 25, it appears, according to the Examiner's interpretation of Innoue, that claims 23 and 25 are mutually exclusive.

As shown in FIG. 13 of Innoue, since multifold feeding preventing member 41 protrudes from movable separation slope surface 8, a piece of paper cannot simultaneously contact both multifold feeding preventing member 41 and movable separation slope surface 8. In other words, if movable separation slope surface 8 is in the position shown in FIG. 11, no paper is

contacting the multifold feeding preventing member 41. And if movable separation slope surface 8 is in the position shown in FIG. 12, and a paper is contacting the multifold feeding preventing member 41, such a paper cannot also contact the movable separation slope surface 8. Further, if movable separation slope surface 8 moves from the position shown in FIG. 12 to the position shown in FIG. 11 while a paper is contacting the multifold feeding preventing member 41, the movable separation slope surface 8 would remove the paper from contacting the multifold feeding preventing member 41.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Innoue neither discloses nor suggests "...wherein the lever selectively contacts the paper while the stripper contacts the paper."

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 23 and 36 patentably distinguish over the cited art and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at page 11, item 5, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Innoue. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at pages 15, 21, and 22, items 6, 7, 12, and 13, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 9, 13, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Innoue, and further in view of Kan et al. (U.S 5,443,251 – hereinafter Kan). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 18, item 8, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Innoue in view of Kan, and further view of Park (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132570 – hereinafter Park). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 18, item 9, the Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Innoue in view of Kan, and further view of Furuki et al. (U.S 6,000,689 – hereinafter Furuki). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 19, item 10, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Innoue in view of Kan, and further view of Hirano et al. (U.S 5,485,991– hereinafter Hirano). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 20, item 11, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Innoue in view of Brown et al. (U.S 4,349,126– hereinafter Brown). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 24, item 14, the Examiner rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Innoue in view of Park. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claims 8, 10, and 32 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

As noted above, the subject matter of claims 2 and 27 have been respectively incorporated into claims 1 and 21. And the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into independent claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 31, and 33 are now allowable.

Additionally, regarding claims 10 and 35, Applicant respectfully submits that Park appears to valid art only under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that at the time of invention the subject application, the subject application and Park were subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity, namely, Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits, under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), that Park is not a valid reference for an obviousness rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 10 has been incorporated into independent claim 9, and that claims 9, 11-13, and 35 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all

pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 1, 2006

By: 
Michael A. Bush
Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached drawings includes new FIGS. 10 and 11, illustrating a first case where a lever does not contact paper, and a second case where the lever contacts the paper, respectively, to explain an operation of another embodiment of the apparatus of FIG. 4.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is being presented.